# THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of Eastern Churches Number of "Pax," founded 1931.)

VOL. V

JULY-DECEMBER, 1942

Nos. 3 & 4

## THE MEANING OF THE CHURCH UNITY OCTAVE<sup>1</sup>

T was a little band of Friars of the Atonement, of the American Episcopalian Church, who first thought to dedicate these eight days to prayer for the unity of Christendom. They can hardly have foreseen the welcome which awaited the idea they initiated. It is not often that practices initiated outside the pale of the Latin Church of the West find a welcome within it; yet already have we seen this octave celebrated with enthusiasm and splendour, gathering vast congregations to hear celebrated preachers, in some of the most famous cathedrals and basilicas of Western Christendom; churches which doff for a space even the ornaments and ritual of their native Latin Rite so as to manifest the diversity in unity of Christianity by the employment of other tongues and other rituals in the worship of God. We have lived to see Popes themselves, not only blessing and encouraging this Anglican-born observance, but personally participating in it. Perhaps more remarkable still is the welcome which the observance has received even from those who find themselves unable to accept, or even obliged to repudiate, the dogmatic presuppositions of its originators. Eastern Orthodox and Western Evangelicals, if not as yet in considerable number or with so much official approval, have joined and are joining in this common cry of Christendom before the throne of God. Though as yet the observance of the Octave is not at all so widespread or so fervent as some of us could wish, we have reason, I think, to thank God that it is already a considerable achievement. At the lowest estimate it indicates a salutary uneasiness

<sup>1</sup> Extract from the Report of the Proceedings at the Church Unity Octave, held at Blackfriars, Oxford, January 18th to 25th, 1942.

By the courtesy of the Editor of the Report.

of conscience among a considerable body of Christians of divers denominations and allegiances, a dissatisfaction with the previous atomisation of Christendom with its sectarian pride and rivalry, an awakening sense of the responsibility of our failure to conserve and extend Christian unity for the hideous state of the world to-day; a realisation that the past and present state of divided Christendom is an ugly defiance and negation of the purpose for which God became man, lived, taught, bled and rose again. It is a symptom that, at very least, we can no longer stop our ears to the old pagan's encomium, "How the Christians love one another,"

which has become the new pagan's ironic reproach.

In the long and shameful story of divided Christendom we may read of many previous endeavours to restore unity. A few have succeeded, at least in part and for a time, in restoring some unity between this or that Christian group; but they have done little to arrest effectively the general process of disintegration. Many more such attempts have failed, completely and ignominiously. It is not for us to pass judgment on the past; but the lessons of history are there for us to learn, and I think that it should be possible for us to congratulate ourselves that, this time at least, in the observance of this octave, we are not making the same mistakes, that now at last we are engaged in an endeavour which is setting about things the right way, the only really effective way, a way which, though much less spectacular, much less "sensibly practical" by the activist standards of worldly wisdom, is for that very reason more full of promise and hope.

For if we would study the reasons for the failure of past efforts at reunion, or the reasons for their only very partial success, we shall find, I think, that two factors have most notably contributed to their ruin. There has been all too often and in the first place, a certain impurity of motive, the end aimed at has been too imperfectly focussed, or perhaps we should say too perfectly focussed, and that only in the light of temporal expediency or purely human idealism. Sometimes what has been envisaged has been something totally different from, and even incompatible with, the unity of the Body of Christ. Just as, for instance, the alien hand of the civil power, guided by considerations of home and foreign policy, has been allowed all too effective a part in rending into disiecta membra the Body of Christ on earth; so too has the civil power, guided by considerations of political expediency, played too prominent a part in many of the various attempted reunions of history. To overcome

confessional strife among a people with a view to establishing national unity and order, to seek union with foreign churches with a view to obtaining the assistance of foreign arms and troops against threatened military aggression, need not in themselves be evil motives unworthy of a civil power intent on its obligations. But they tend inevitably to envisage a very different kind of unity from the true unity of the Body of Christ. Moreover, the unity of the Church is not something that can be imposed from above by human authority, whether civil or even ecclesiastical, without the consent of the faithful generally. And here we are confronted with a second factor which has too frequently frustrated attempts at reunion. Too often such endeavours have been the work solely of a handful of savants or a handful of hierarchs, with or without the intrusive encouragement of the secular power, but lacking the support of the broad masses of their coreligionists. Authentic Christian unity cannot be autocratically imposed. For whether our conceptions of Church Order be Ultramontane or Congregationalist, it is the people who make the Church, and if the heart of the people is not in the union, the union will be illusory; it will be no firm bond of love but at best a precarious and purely juridical agreement, unrepresentative of the bodies which it purports to unite. Both these factors, the intrusion of the political and the absence of popular support may well have contributed to the impermanence of the Marian reunion in England; they were certainly conspicuous in the breakdown of the Reunion of Florence, the "Conversations" of Santa Clara, Bossuet, Leibnitz-perhaps in part of those of Malines, Lausanne, Stockholm, Edinburgh, Oxford. Authentic Christian unity must be of authentically Christian inspiration and motivation; it must be the work and the will, not merely of a few unrepresentative Church leaders and divines, though these must needs have a unique function to play, but of the whole body of the faithful.

That is but one way of saying what it will be my endeavour further to enlarge upon: that Christian unity must be, and can only be, the work of prayer, the prayer of Christians generally. And the peculiar merit, as I see it, of the observance of this Unity Octave lies in the fact that this has been

clearly envisaged at the outset.

You are perhaps sceptical. What, it may be asked, is to be expected of eight days of prayer to undo the disintegration of centuries?—to reverse an age-long historic process, to fill up fissures which have widened and deepened and consolidated into vast chasms with the passage of time?

Eight days of prayer to demolish the walls of partition raised higher and more impenetrable as generation has succeeded to generation, each growing up in its self-contained area in increasing error and ignorance regarding those outside its own sphere? For let us have no illusions concerning the magnitude of the task which confronts us. Theological differences have hardened into cultural and psychological heterogeneity. The consequences of these schisms of long ago, however trivial and obsolete their immediate causes may sometimes have been, are far-reaching and deep-reaching; they have become part and parcel of our whole mental structure; they have sunk beneath the threshold of consciousness to become elements of our inherited unconscious. For Christendom is like a submerged continent, disrupted into an archipelago by ancient volcanic disturbances. With each volcanic eruption the expanse of the inundating ocean has separated us more and more from one another; the inhabitants of each island have severally developed their own languages, customs, cultures, rites, myths, prejudices, conscious and unconscious assumptions, almost unbeknown to the inhabitants of other islands. Do I say unknown? Transport between the islands has not been easy, and travellers' tales have not always been quite veracious. Preservation of the tribe, its totems and tabus, has been thought to necessitate false witness about natives of other islands. It is not only in the secular state that lying propaganda, conscious or unconscious, is conceived to be a fitting instrument to induce esprit de corps or morale.

Do we really believe that prayer can undo all that? Yes, all that; and more than all that. For the organisers of this Octave have seen that to pray for Christian unity is not merely to pray for the restoration of the status quo ante, not merely to restore the lost continent in defensive alliance against all other pre-Christian and post-Christian continents, but nothing less than the unity of all mankind, of the whole world, in Christ Jesus. The unity of the Church means nothing less than universal brotherhood through identification with the Son of God, whereby God becomes our Father in the unifying life of the Spirit of Love. So the Apostle bids us pray for all men, for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. So likewise the most ancient surviving prayer for Christian unity, the Eucharistic prayer of the Didache, begs that God will gather together His people from the four winds, from the ends of the earth,

and lead this His Church into His Kingdom.

So also this Octave is devoted to prayer, not only for the reunion of East and West, of the churches of the Anglican communion, of the Evangelical bodies, of those who have abandoned Christian faith and practice altogether, but also for the integration within the one brotherhood of Jewry and Islam, and the teeming millions of "the rest."

Humanly speaking it is a fantastic enterprise; so much so that we may well ask ourselves if we are really serious. Was ever a more absurd insufficiency of means directed to a more hopelessly impossible end? Is it not positively presumptuous to anticipate so radical and cataclysmic a metamorphosis of mankind as an answer to our poor prayers? Can we even with sincerity pray for such an object? May it not be that our very recourse to prayer is an evasion of the complexities of the issue, an escapist refusal to face the facts?

If we are inclined to argue thus, it must be because we falsely preconceive that for which we pray, or because we misapprehend the very character of prayer itself. Too often we are apt to conceive of prayer as at best a secondary and auxiliary support to the real work of reunion which we conceive to consist in conferences, conversations, discussions and negotiations; a harmless consolation for those who are too busy or not clever enough to engage in these "really practical" undertakings. Against all such assumptions and contentions I must submit that such is the character of that for which we pray that prayer alone can really achieve it; that all other reunionist activities are vain and worse than vain if they are not themselves subordinated to the work which prayer alone can accomplish. Prayer, I would maintain, is the only means which is scientifically commensurate with the end we seek. If we suppose otherwise, it must be, I think, that we misconceive the whole character of that for which we pray. Indeed, I would go further. I would. say that it is only in and by prayer that we can hope to begin to understand what it is we are praying for. If we pray truly, we must discover the character of the unity for which we pray by the very act of praying for it.

Allow me to elaborate the theme. True prayer, Christian prayer, we are often reminded, is neither magical incantation nor passive resignation to inevitable Fate. True prayer does not seek to harness divine energy for the fulfilment of the desires of our own egos, however worthy or even lofty they may be. On the contrary by prayer we transcend our own egos and the desires of our own hearts, even the human idealisms of our own mind, submitting them to the purifying

power of divine love, integrating them into the divine Will. The importance of prayer, it has often been said, lies not in the fact that it fulfils our desires but that it transforms them; not by the annihilation of our own ideas and our own wills but by the annihilation of their autonomy, and by their fusion into the divine economy and the divine Will. And it is always possible that our very desire for unity is falsely motivated and falsely conceived; in need, therefore, of precisely such transformation and fusion as prayer affords. I have already suggested that such impurity of preconception and motivation may well account for the breakdown of many attempts at reunion in the past. I think the danger may always be present. May it not be that our very aspirations for unity, the very unity we aspire after, may be in need of purification? Is it not possible that our desire for unity itself may spring from a state of mind which is radically schismatic, sectarian, selfish; which is wholly alien from, and even hostile to, that oneness for which Christ prayed, "that they may be one, as Thou Father in Me, and I in Thee, that they may be perfect in one"? Christian unity is nothing less and nothing else than participation in the unity of the Trinity through the Incarnation; it is identification with the consciousness of the Son of God, Who is constituted as a distinct Person by His filial relationship to God as His Father, united to Him in the hypostatic Love of the Divine Spirit. That is the peace and the unity which is offered to us; not as the world gives does He give to us. Any unity which we may devise which is not conducive to, or does not spring from, that authentic Christian unity, is no true Christian unity whatever it may call itself. It may even be an anti-Christian unity. Truly enough that interior unity of the grace of Christ our Head must be expressed in external fellowship and external order and organisation; it is itself defective if it lacks that visible sacrament. But external unity without that interior unity in the Trinity is spurious, and may be pernicious. May I intrude the purely personal opinion that there are some calls to Christian unity at the present time which we should regard with some caution? We are sometimes bidden to unite to save our own reputation from the mockery of unbelievers. Christian unity is sometimes presented as a means to preserve our skins, our common cultural and our material vested interests. Again, we are sometimes bidden to unite in the name of a spirit which is rather that of the Boanerges than that of the love of God. We hear talk of what is ominously called a Christian Front. We are bidden to behold how numerous and how efficiently

organised and disciplined are the secularist forces of totalitarianism; it is suggested that we must close our own ranks. become equally efficiently organised and centralised to meet and to conquer the demoniac forces in the world on their own ground. More painful still, the very language of the totalitarian Parties is sometimes employed to describe the unity of the Church; the Petrine primacy is described in terms indistinguishable from those of the Führerprinzip; the very Church herself is proclaimed as the authentic totalitarian society. Whatever is intended by such phraseology, it is, I am convinced, highly dangerous. The Christian idea of unity and fellowship—κοινωνια—is utterly incompatible with the principles of organised mass-civilisation. It is based not on numbers, mechanical efficiency, co-ordination of productive forces, the loss of the personality in the mass by regimentation and blind obedience, but on that which totalitarianism precisely destroys; free personal relationship. Even from the standpoint of purely worldly wisdom it is idle to suppose that totalitarianised Christianity can measure its strength with the vast material forces of secular totalitarianism. If ever Christendom becomes sufficiently organised and powerful to meet the modern mass movements of secularism in such a way on their own ground, the issue of the struggle would be unimportant. For Christendom would have ceased to be Christian, and will have already surrendered to the enemy.

Christ comes not to judge, but to save the world. Nor does judgment rest with us. He leaves the world to judge itself by its own acceptance or rejection of His message. Christian unity must be really Catholic; it excludes all exclusion; all clannishness among those who call themselves Christians at the expense of those who call themselves non-Christians. It can resist the quantitative uniformities of the romantic myth of blood and soil or of the scientist myth of monistic class-struggle dialectic, only in the measure in which it is true to its own faith in God-given relational unity. Only by so doing can it integrate these partial—and because partial, tyrannical—conceptions of human nature and human destiny. The integrity of society is dependent upon the integrity of the personality, and the integrity of the personality is dependent upon grace, upon relationship with God, upon integration into the Trinity through the absorption of the anarchic self into the Self of Christ. And that precisely is the work of prayer—in the widest acceptation of the word. Prayer is precisely the relational event — the ascensus mentis in Deum whereby we accept and deepen our filial relationship to God,

and in so doing discover His Fatherhood and its consequence,

the brotherhood of man.

It is not therefore just a matter of praying for unity, in the sense in which we may pray for something heterogeneous to the life of prayer itself. It is rather a matter of achieving unity in and by the very fact of praying. More exactly, we may say that by the very fact of praying, and praying truly and persistently (a matter more easily said than done) we discover, and participate in, the unity which God offers us in Christ. The matter may be more clear if we state it negatively rather than positively—in terms of the removal of the causes of division rather than of the establishment of the causes of unity. For what are the causes of division? Just here, of course, we are profoundly disagreed if the question be taken as a challenge to make particular assignations of responsibility. But in general and in principle all Christians must be agreed. What divides us is not grace, not the Christ-spirit within us, not our relationship to God; but our lack of all this. What separates us one from another is not the Divine Humanity within us, not the divine image, not our Christ-mindedness, but the defect of these. What divides us is not the New Humanity, but the human-all-toohuman in its self-assertion, which, from whatever causes, is closed against the influence of divine life, light and love. However we may explain this or that schism, however we may assign its causes, however we may seek to justify it, we must all admit that it would be impossible were it not for some intrusive element of human pride and ignorance on one side or (more probably) on both. And the persistence of schism can, in the last analysis, be due only to the persistence of these, its radical causes. Some element of unredeemed humanity has somewhere asserted itself in independence of its relationship to its centre of gravity and cohesion. Separation in or from the Church is impossible unless there is somewhere, somehow, a self-assertion of the members over and against Christ their Head. From this consideration no one can absolve himself on the grounds of his conviction of the non-schismatic condition of his own situation within the hierarchic order of the Church. It is quite possible to retain, even with dogged determination and fanaticism, what we believe to be the divinely appointed centre of unity—as I myself believe the Chair of Peter to be-and yet to remain interiorly separatist and schismatic; something radical remains within us which is unredeemed, un-at-oned. Vladimir Soloviev was not talking pointlessly when he begged his fellow-Catholics in the West not to be so preoccupied with

protecting and admiring the Petrine foundations of the Church that the building of it was hindered and prevented. And we remain interiorly separatist and schismatic, whatever we may think or say, so long as our individual and collective egos, individually acquired or collectively inherited, assert themselves in independence of the filial Selfhood of Christ. Christianity must remain divided, genuine Christian unity cannot be achieved, until the dark places of our unredeemed nature are exposed to His unifying light, its self-seeking and

self-complacency burnt out by His atoning fire.

Christian unity, then, can only be achieved by the way of the Cross; by the crucifixion of unregenerate selfhood, not only the selfhood of the individual, but the selfhood of man-made or man-spoiled collectivities of which individuals are the conscious or unconscious bearers. Christian unity begins at home, with the hard and painful task of the discovery and elimination of conscious prejudices and inherited prepossessions, together with all the sense of security and complacency which is rooted in our attachment to them; it means a readiness to learn and to unlearn; to sacrifice the comfort of many a human loyalty and illusion, a readiness to detach ourselves from those commandments and traditions of men which make, not only the law but also the very love of God of no effect. It means what Blake called "mental strife," does this crucifixion of selfhood in the attainment of the Divine Image; it means that "crucial thinking" which Mr. Murry has described as a characteristic of truly Christian mental processes.

And all that is the work of what we call prayer; and without prayer it is impossible to accomplish it. In the measure in which we endeavour to accomplish it, we truly pray, even though we fancy we are incapable of prayer. Anything else we do, if it is not guided and inspired by that, will be vain and useless—perhaps very misguided and disruptive. Without this absorption of the fallen, unregenerate Adam into the Selfhood of Christ, it is impossible to ensure or to expect that our labours for Christian unity will be truly a hallowing of the name of Our Father in heaven, rather than a glorification of our own; a seeking for the coming of His Kingdom, the doing of His will on earth as it is in heaven. Prayer precisely ensures, as surely as maybe, that in our activities we are His instruments in the doing of His work, and not just of our own plans, aspirations and ideas. We pray, truly and effectively, only when we pray in the Spirit of His Son, whereby we cry, Abba, Father; when our autonomous selves give place to the Spirit who prays within us with unutterable

groanings. Not that we can attain those high levels of prayer all in a flash. But such must be the direction and tendency of all prayer if it is prayer at all. "Beseeching," said Mother Julian of Norwich, "is a true and gracious and lasting will of the soul, oned and fastened into the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, by the sweet inward work of the Holy Ghost. He showed me, saying, 'I am the ground of thy beseeching."

But as true prayer is not magic, not the self-seeking utilisation of divine power for the fulfilment of our own ends; so neither, I have said, is it passive resignation to divine power to be exercised independently of our collaboration. This is true of all prayer; it is particularly true of prayer for unity. The unity of Christendom depends on the free will and collaboration of Christians; it will not be imposed on us against our will in answer to empty prayers which we fail to implement. It would take me too far afield from my present subject, from the immediate work in hand of this octave of prayer, to discuss in any detail the character of the various external activities by which we may participate to forward Christian unity. Here I would only indicate in general fashion how all such undertakings must fail of

their purpose if they be not the fruit of prayer.

What then, briefly, is the nature of unionist activity? is inevitably largely a matter of personal vocation, of personal circumstance, opportunity and talent. How each of us in our several conditions may best labour for the unity we discover in prayer may itself best be discovered in prayer. Yet there is one task which is open to us all, and which is imposed on us all. That is the struggle against the spirit of separatism, the will to schism, in our own particular circle, among our own co-religionists. There is some danger that unionism, eirenicism—call it what you will—may itself become a sectarian and party label of cliques divorced from the rank and file, and perhaps still more from the hierarchs and ministers, of their own denominations. I have said that attempts at reunion must fall to the ground if they lack general support; I must go further and say that reunion schemes have little prospect of success without determined popular demand. Caritas Christi urget nos. The repentance for Christian division must be widespread and it must be deep; its healing must be a costly and painful processatonement, at-one-ment, is always that. But we cannot be apostles of this unity unless we ourselves pay the price; unless to ourselves it is not merely an abstract theory but something lived in the hard surrender of self to the Self of Christ, of the life of prayer.

The same must be said of all those other unionist activities which of their nature are more specialised and must be the work of the few. I have in mind more particularly the vast field of theological elaboration and confrontation between theologians of different denominations and obediences, the whole work of mutual understanding. The days would seem to be happily passing when it was cheerfully supposed that dogmatic differences were of no account; when reunion all round could be attained by beating up the milk of human kindness into butter and serving it on a good and lordly dish -in the fashion of Ronald Knox's famous satire. It would seem to be now more generally realised that the unity of the Church cannot be established on a basis of empty-mindedness dignified with the name of broad-mindedness, nor a genial putting up with what we regard as other people's eccentricities dignified with the name of tolerance. To the immense influence of Karl Barth, in particular, however unfavourably we may judge it in some respects, is due a more widespread realisation that genuine Christian unity can be achieved only on the basis of uncompromising loyalty to the Truth which is the Word of God in Christ Jesus, that there is no unity in the One Lord which is not unity in one Faith. But that does not mean that, with a bald "take it or leave it" attitude, we can patter out our dogmatic formularies and leave matters at that. The truths which are expressed by our dogmatic formulas may be indeed absolute and immutable—we should sin against unity itself were we to compromise on them. But the formulas themselves are relative, and still more our understanding of their content, and of its co-relation in analogia fidei, was always limited and often subject to further penetration and even revision. Herein lies an immense field for mutual explanation, comparison and confrontation. Nothing can come of such work if, for the theologians engaged in it, their dogmas are but dead formulas, parrot repetitions, soporific mantras, material for purely logical analysis; if they are not rather expressions of an existential Christianity, experienced in and animated by the life of prayer. Only by that life-in-Christ of prayer will they be sure to find on a higher level the common ground which underlies the diversities of expressions of other minds trained in other traditions, conditioned by other historical environments and preoccupations, and using other languages. This applies still more to the wider task of discovering the affinities and differences between Christianity and "other religions." Only if Christianity is itself lived are we in a position to see the element of Christianity which is latent

in all religions; shall we be enabled to distinguish the strictly and universally Christian from those purely cultural and local deposits whose confusion, in the more recent but happily passing past, has made a byword of much would-be Christian missionary effort. We are beginning perhaps to see better now what the Church of the Old Testament and the earlier Christian Church understood quite well: that its own uniqueness consists not in substituting itself for but in fulfilling, and even borrowing from and integrating, the inner content of the symbolism, myths, cults and spiritual techniques from outside the visible confines of Jewry and Christendom.

Labour for unity, then, opens up a vast field of intellectual work to be done, theoretical and practical. To this work the historian and the sociologist, the philologist and the anthropologist, the student of folklore and mythology and comparative religion and analytical psychology all have much to contribute. More especially the theologian who will co-relate and apply their findings in the light of the dynamic Word of God to men. But these or whatever other line of activities we may be able to adopt will be fruitless if they are employed merely in the service of some purely human ideal or scheme; if we direct them to the chimæra of a new Christian unity based on the lowest common denominator of existing forms of Christianity statically conceived. Christianity to be united must be a fearlessly integral Christianity, whatever we may find that to mean. Similarly vain is the chimæra of a brand-new syncretist world-religion composed

artificially and eclectically of bits of all religions.

But a world-religion the world must have. Thoughtful men are being led to see, as the present world-chaos is meant to make them see, that real world-community must be the aim of our secular strivings. And they would seem to be beginning to see too, even in the most unexpected quarters, that civil community always had been and always must be based on a personal relationship to that which transcends society if society is not itself to become a tyrannical impersonal deity. I have said, and I must repeat, that it is idle to envisage religious unity as a means to civil peace and order. It must be sought for its own sake, for God's sake, or not at all. But world peace and order and freedom would certainly be its connatural fruits. It may seem ridiculous to see in the observance of this Octave by a handful of Churchpeople the first stirrings of a movement which will at long last bring peace and brotherhood to the human race. And indeed we have no guarantee of so happy an issue. But the prayer which this Octave inculcates, precisely by relieving us of

our own self-centred activism and transforming us into the instruments of divine purpose, will relieve us of fussiness and anxiety for the morrow. We do not ask to see the distant scene; we know only that there is much in the past that screams for atonement, it is screaming now in its consequences in this unprecedented torment of humanity; the immediate steps are plain. "To-day if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." And to-day, through the smoke and the blood and the tears of world total war, His voice comes to us, as never before, in the agonised defacement of His image, which is man. For that defacement our own past failure to collaborate in Christ's atoning work is chiefly and ultimately responsible; not only have we failed in the worldmission entrusted to us; we have broken His body. Inasmuch as we have done it unto them we have done it unto Him; inasmuch as we have done it unto Him in His body, which His very crucifiers shrank from rending, we have done it unto them. The magnitude and costliness of the task before us dwindle into insignificance before the immensity of its grandeur and of its imperative need and obligation.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

# THE EASTERN ORTHODOX AND ANGLICAN CHURCHES

T first sight there would seem to be no special connection whatever between work for Catholic Unity with the Eastern Churches and any similar work with Christian bodies in English speaking countries. In fact it might even seem that the problems presented by each are not only separate but actually antagonistic. What possible line of thought or religious sympathy can there be between a Christian of the East and a member of the Anglican Church or other Christian body of the English speaking people? One can only answer that facts show that when contact has once been made many English speaking people have found themselves in sympathy with Orthodox thought and practice.

It will be well to give some brief historical account of such contacts in recent times.<sup>1</sup> In 1888 the Lambeth Conference stated its desire to enter into closer relations with the Eastern Churches, but added "that it would be difficult for us to enter into intimate relations with the Eastern Church so long as it retains the use of eikons, invocation of the saints and the cult of the Blessed Virgin."<sup>2</sup> Very much has changed since then, not that the Orthodox have abated one inch in their devotion to the holy eikons, the saints, or the Blessed Virgin Mary, but that Anglican authorities are beginning to view

these beliefs in a new light.

1 There had been contacts in the seventeenth century; the famous Patriarch Cyril Lucar opened a correspondence with Archbishop Abbot in 1616 with the result that a Greek priest, Metrophanes Critopoulos, was sent to study at Oxford. He became later Patriarch of Alexandria. In 1621 the Patriarch of Constantinople sent the famous Codex Alexandrinus to Charles I, and an Arabic MS. of the Pentateuch to Archbishop Laud.

During this century there were some English chaplains in the East (e.g., Aleppo in Syria, Constantinople) who did much "to dispose and incline the Greek Church to a communion with the Church of England." In 1677 the Metropolitan of Samos visited England and was received by the Duke of York and Bishop Compton, who was ultimately responsible for a church being built for the Greeks in Soho. In 1716 there were certain negotiations between the English Non-Jurors and the Patriarch of Alexandria, but nothing came of it. Archbishop Wake had, however, written to the Patriarch of Jerusalem a letter pointing out that the Non-Jurors were schismatics. This letter prevented the Church of England being compromised by the proposals of this unofficial group. For further details see The Relations of East and West since the Great Schism, by Ivan R. Young. (S.P.C.K.).

2 Quoted in Anglo-Catholicism and Orthodoxy, by W. A. Visser't Hooft,

p. 112 (S.C.M., 1933). Throughout this article I have made much use of this excellent book. Dr. Visser't Hooft is a Swiss Protestant and so can

be considered an impartial judge as well as a keen observer.

In the same year the Archbishop of Canterbury sent Mr. Birkbeck, as his representative, to Kiev for the celebration of the commemoration of St. Vladimir. Mr. Birkbeck was so impressed by Orthodoxy that he decided to give his life up to the cause of Anglo-Orthodox friendship, and remained for many years a constant agent of rapprochement between the two Churches. It was due to him that the Church of England was represented at the crowning of the late Tsar and that the Archbishop of York visited Russia in 1896. During the last years of the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth century a good many contacts were made between Anglicans and Orthodox and these led to the establishment of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association<sup>1</sup> In 1920 a delegation of the Patriarch of Constantinople was sent to the Lambeth Conference and in 1922 the Patriarch communicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury that the Holy Synod accepted Anglican Orders by economy as those "of the Roman, the Old Catholic and the Armenian Churches." It was in 1930, however, that a delegation representing eight of the Orthodox Churches headed by the Patriarch of Alexandria attended the Lambeth Conference of that year. This was indeed a meeting of outstanding importance, for not only were a series of important questions concerning the teaching and belief of the Anglican Church put by the Orthodox delegates and discussed by them with a committee of Anglican bishops appointed for that purpose, but it resulted both in the formation of a permanent Conjoint Doctrinal Commission<sup>3</sup> of Anglicans and Orthodox, and also in the sending of a special Anglican Delegation to Bucarest to discuss Anglican teaching4 further with a Rumanian Commission. The scope of the Conference at Bucarest was the statements exchanged at Lambeth (1930) and which had been formulated so as to satisfy the requirements on the part of the Orthodox delegation touching the belief of the Church of England in connection with the Sacrament of Orders. The Anglo-Rumanian Conference met in June 1935, and in March 1936 the Sacred Synod of the Patriarchate of Rumania declared itself satisfied with the result of the Conference and ready to accept the validity of Anglican Orders. The final word rests with the Anglican

<sup>2</sup> For a treatment of the Orthodox recognition of Anglican Orders, see THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY, Jan. and April 1937, and Oct. 1940.

<sup>1</sup> In 1867 the Eastern Church Association came into being and was reconstituted in 1893, and then was founded in 1906 the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union. The present Association is the result of the merging of these two.

<sup>4</sup> See The Christian East. Spring, 1931.

authorities, as to whether they, as a whole, will confirm the doctrinal agreement arrived at by the said Conference, and this confirmation was given, as far as the convocations of Canterbury and York were concerned, in the February of

1937.1

It still remains for the whole Anglican Communion as such to ratify the doctrinal position<sup>2</sup> that the Mother Church has taken upon herself. This is, however, the most important event that has occurred in the Church of England since the Reformation, for the agreement arrived at by the Anglo-Rumanian Conference upon the doctrine and significance of the Sacred Ministry, the Holy Eucharist, Holy Tradition and upon Justification, also a preliminary agreement upon the nature and character of Confirmation, Absolution, the Marriage Blessing and Unction of the Sick has been implemented by

the Convocations of Canterbury and York.3

This then gives us some idea of the official relationship between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches. It can certainly be described as cordial; five of the Orthodox Churches acknowledge the validity of Anglican Orders by economy4, there is a frequent interchange of visits among the leading bishops and clergy on both sides and also to a certain extent, among their respective Church students. The Orthodox Churches that are in most close touch in this way with the Church of England are those of Constantinople, Greece (though this Church, like that of Serbia, has not officially recognized Anglican Orders), Serbia, Rumania, Jerusalem and Alexandria (especially under the late Patriarch). The great Russian Church because of its present distressed condition is precluded from taking any official action as a whole, though through its theologians, its past influence on other Orthodox Churches and its mere numbers, it still carries great weight and is very much a living force in Orthodoxy.

This Russian Orthodoxy largely makes contact with Anglicans through the unofficial (and for this very reason in some ways more vital) conferences and study circles of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, composed for the most part of some of the younger clergy and a large number

<sup>2</sup> For full details see *Report of the Conference at Bucarest* issued by the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, Church House, Westminster, S.W.I.

3 See The Christian East. Jan., July, 1937.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The unanimous approval of both houses was given at York in May 1936; at Canterbury in February 1937, the Upper House agreed and the Lower House passed the Resolution by a majority of 104 to 6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> These five are Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Cyprus and Rumania.

of the laity, students and others. The Fellowship and its method of penetration by learning to know one another's prayerlife is spreading to other Orthodox groups, Rumanians, Estonians, Serbs, as well as to the non-Anglican Reformation Churches, e.g., Sweden. When we add to this the growing influence of the Orthodox in Œcumenical circles, especially in the Faith and Order Movement, and when we realize that the Anglican contact, official and otherwise, is not confined to the Mother Country but extends to the Anglican Communion as a whole, in the United States of America as well as our colonies, something of the significance of the

Anglican and Orthodox relations can be gauged.

From the above one might be led to expect great results, one might expect that a lead would be given by the Anglican bishops to their clergy and people on the lines of solid Catholic teaching with regard to the Sacraments and even on such matters as the Catholic teaching concerning Our Lady and the Communion of Saints. One might expect that on account of this official contact with the Orthodox Church the central body of the Church of England, including the bishops, would now line themselves up with the definitely Catholic party in the Anglican communion so as to be ready for the hoped for day of intercommunion and eventual Church Unity. The facts of the case, however, as far as we have been able to gather, are otherwise. To start with, a large number of the Catholic minded clergy and laity seem, if not entirely ignorant of the above negotiations, at most to look upon them as mere statements on paper which are likely to have little effect in practice. And many of the bishops seem to be turning in the direction of home reunion with Nonconformity. Yet we are not inclined to say that the official (and historical) contacts we have recorded stand for nothing. They certainly have been noted by the Nonconformists themselves. Mr. Archibald Harrison in a lecture criticises this position: "The Lambeth Conference of 1931 seemed to be impressed more by the hope of closer fellowship between the Anglican and Greek Churches than between Anglican and Nonconformist at home. The approach to Constantinople was good, particularly in the days that followed the tragic experiences of the Greek Church in Russia. 'This ought ye to have done and not to have left the other undone.' There are, however, still many Anglican priests for whom the Exarch of Bulgaria looms larger than the Moderator of the Free Church Assembly, any archimandrite on the other side of Europe is of much more consequence than the Congregational minister in the next street. There is some

lack of a sense of perspective here." We are not sure that, from an Anglo-Catholic point of view, it was not more important to approach the Orthodox East first and then to approach the Nonconformist at home, perhaps even in company with the Orthodox as in the meetings of Faith and Order. We would even go further and say that, in spite of what we have recorded above, there is often a real kinship in outlook between the Anglican and the educated Orthodox. This view can, we think, be best stated in the words of Visser't Hooft: in spite of deep-rooted differences "both Churches desire to be considered as continuing the early and undefiled tradition of the early ages of Christianity. Both magnify that tradition which the Christian Church had in common before it was broken into Eastern and Western Christendom. Both reject, therefore, all innovations which have been made by other Churches since that normative period of Churchhistory. Both have a basis of definite doctrine, but both leave a certain freedom with regard to unformulated dogmatic truth. Both emphasize the indispensability of the historic episcopate for the order of Church life, but reject an over-emphasis on the hierarchical character of the Church. And last, but not least, both Churches consider themselves as Churches of the Incarnation . . . in the sense that they deduce the whole tenor of their religious life, individual and social, from the Incarnation as the central fact of all human life."<sup>2</sup> This is the view of a Swiss Protestant ten years ago, and although one could cite many individual cases of disagreement, we think it represents the theological outlook of the practising Churchman of the central Anglican tradition. If we add to this the further comment of a Catholic writer3: "The English Christian is 'patristic' rather than 'scholastic'; he does not mind if religious doctrines are not formulated with minute accuracy and clear definition: he is content not to try to explain divine mysteries (so far as they can be explained): he does not mind a measure of human inconsistency and seeming contradiction in religion . . . he is suspicious of a rationalistic approach to religion; he is neither clerical nor anti-clerical, and tends to be impatient of legitimate authority divorced from personal goodness; he is more conscious of the Person of Christ than of the Church of Christ; he fights shy of juridical concepts in theology and whatever sayours

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Vid., The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion, by Archibald W. Harrison, p. 188.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 130-131. <sup>3</sup> "Russian Spirituality" by Donald Attwater, p. 96, in Religion in Russia.

to him of legalistic morality . . . he has a respect for the Lord's Supper, but no particular attraction towards an exterior cultus of the Blessed Sacrament; he is not specially impressed by a celibate clergy, and is repelled by a liturgy of which he cannot understand (or sometimes even hear) a single word. How like the Orientals all this is!" Mr. Attwater is speaking in more general terms and not only of Anglicans though it is certainly typical of the outlook of the ordinary members

of the Church of England.

Let us now consider the foregoing account in its bearing on the trend towards Catholic Unity in this country. The above quotations refer rather to an Englishman's approach to things Catholic than to any precise acceptance of Catholic Truth. It is an attitude of mind rather than a statement of This approach to Religon is claimed to be akin to that of the Orthodox, yet it is certain that the Orthodox insist on the importance of dogmatic definition, not maybe as precise as is demanded in scholastic thought, but definition. This is evident from the enquiries made by the Orthodox authorities concerning the meaning of the dogmatic content of the official Anglican Service Books regarding their teaching on the priesthood and the Holy Eucharist. We have mentioned the Orthodox Delegation and the Lambeth Conference of 1930, the formation of a permanent Conjoint Doctrinal Commission of Anglicans and the Conference at Bucarest in 1935-36. Whatever misgivings these may arouse both on the part of Protestants and some of the Catholic-minded Anglicans, the fact remains that they were an official approach, as far as they went, on the part of the Orthodox and Anglican authorities and that one result was the setting down of certain dogmatic statements which were for the most part couched in the terminology of the Orthodox Church.1 This has doubtless been done in the first place because the negotiations are with the Orthodox, but also in order to avoid scholastic and post-Tridentine definitions, partly to keep clear of the controversies of the Reformation, partly too because of the attitude of mind described above. This being so, is it not possible to take these dogmatic statements at their face value? We are not here considering questions of continuity or the theological background of the sixteenth century. The Reformation radically modified the spiritual life of English Christians;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For suggested "Terms of Intercommunion" see *The Christian East*, Summer 1931. For "Report of Archbishop Nectarie" and "Minutes of Anglo-Orthodox Conference," *ibid.*, Spring 1931. For comments on Orthodox theological terms, *ibid.*, Winter 1930–31. For comments on "Terms of Intercommunion," *ibid.*, No. 1, 1933.

they acquired a code of religious belief and practice which differentiated them from their fellow Europeans, and we have the results. We are now confronted with a Church of England which has in an official way turned to the Orthodox Church with the ultimate hope of intercommunion, and hence she must see if she can accept all the essentials of the dogmatic teaching of the Orthodox Church. So far she has been specially considering her terminology in regard to the priesthood and the Eucharistic Sacrifice; later it will be the full dogmatic content of the Christian East. This surely is an approach to Catholic Faith, though not expressed in Latin categories.

There has always been, however, a party in the Church of England that stood for a return to the ancient Church traditions of England's past, her oneness with the Latin West that made her part of Christendom, and they are jealous that she should express herself in things Catholic as the rest of Western Europeans. At the same time the Church of England has become conscious of her duty towards the members of the Free Churches that can rightly claim to be part of England's

religious tradition.

These are some of the present problems that confront those desirous for Christian Unity. Some light may be thrown on the subject if we in future articles consider the patristic terminology used by the Orthodox theologians in their discussions of Anglican doctrine, and also the attitude of the Orthodox to the Protestant Churches and the Œcumenical

Movement.

Before this present war the Orthodox meant nothing to the ordinary Englishman, even the good Christian; but now surely the Greek and the Serbian have rightly claimed their imagination and we hope their prayers. Still more does the mystery of Russia demand their attention. By coming to see and learning to understand, they may find themselves looking at a people saving their soul, and, understanding, they may pray and do likewise.

Dom Bede Winslow.

### MEMBERSHIP OF THE CHURCH

N what sense can baptized non-Catholics be said to belong to the Church of Christ? We are sometimes told that while they are not members of its *body* they may belong to its *soul*, but this convenient explanation

does not really tell us very much.

St. Thomas in the Summa (3, 8, 3) carefully enumerates all the possible different conceptions of the "mystical Body of the Church," corresponding to the various modes and degrees of union with Christ its Head. In the most restricted sense, representing the highest degree of union, he limits the Body to those who are actually in glory. Taking a wider view, he includes together with the saints all those on earth who are in a state of grace. Then comes a still broader conception, admitting even sinners, provided they are united to Christ by *faith*. Finally he extends the notion of the mystical Body to include all mankind upon earth; because every soul, with the exception of those finally separated from Christ in hell, comes under His saving influence and headship.

Now it is obvious that non-Catholics are members of the Body in this last and widest sense, because they are living human beings, capable of salvation; it is equally plain that they are not members in the first and most restricted sense, because they are not yet in heaven. As regards the other two conceptions of the mystical Body, it is useless to discuss whether as individuals our friends are in a state of grace, so the only question left for us to decide is whether or not they

are united to Christ by faith.

The Faith of Christ, we believe, is embodied in the Catholic Church on earth. The only visible criterion, therefore, by which we can judge that a person is united to Christ by faith is his acceptance of Catholic teaching, together with the Sacrament of Baptism. Non-Catholics, however, appear to satisfy only the latter requirement; and their position is for that reason an anomalous one, because Baptism is itself

the outward sign of faith.

It is clear that the possession of Baptism alone does not necessarily imply union with Christ by faith, still less that the recipient is in a state of grace. But Baptism has this invariable effect, that it impresses upon the soul of the recipient a kind of distinguishing mark, giving him a definite *status*, both in the sight of God and in relation to the Catholic Body. In God's sight it gives the baptized person a sort of claim or title to the supernatural life, unavailing indeed so long as the soul presents obstacles to the bestowal of grace, but

immediately effective when these are absent. Corresponding closely to this interior, invisible effect of Baptism there is an outward, juridical effect in relation to the Catholic Body; for just as it confers a conditional inward title to grace, it also bestows a conditional right to the visible means of grace—the Sacraments. This right to the Sacraments, inherent in the baptismal character, is in the nature of things inoperative so long as the baptized person is outwardly separated from the Catholic Body in belief. Such a person cannot enjoy full membership in the Catholic Body, but his Baptism does in fact constitute him a persona in Ecclesia Christi, subject in theory at least to its jurisdiction, and possessing the fundamental rights of a member except in so far as these are curtailed

by the fact of his separation. (C.J.C. 87).

This juridical restriction of privileges by the Church is manifestly necessary for two principal reasons, related to the very essence of the Church: (1) to ensure that the means of grace are not administered to those who lack the necessary inward dispositions in respect of faith; (2) in order to safeguard the Church's external unity of witness. As regards the former of these objects, it is evident that the Catholic Body cannot judge directly of a person's inner dispositions, but must apply the visible criterion of conformity to Catholic teaching. It is possible, however, that this external test may sometimes be misleading. A non-Catholic who accepts the Christian revelation so far as he knows it, and is guiltless of any formal heresy, does not in fact present any interior obstacle to the reception of the Sacraments. In respect of faith he belongs to the mystical Body; though he cannot be publicly recognized as a member of the Catholic community on earth. The exclusion of such a person from the Sacraments to which he is inwardly entitled constitutes a hardship, but it is necessary (except perhaps in very exceptional circumstances and secluso scandalo), at least for the second reason given above, inasmuch as his admission to the Sacraments would compromise the Church's visible unity of faith.

As a rule, however, we cannot regard non-Catholics simply as individuals, belonging by rights to the Catholic Body but unhappily excluded from its privileges. Usually they give allegiance to some other body, in which they claim to enjoy the full privileges of Church membership. Assuming always that they are guiltless of any formal error, so that they present no inward obstacle to the reception of the Sacraments, can it be maintained that their admission to Church privileges by a separated body nullifies their practical "excommunication" by Rome, and so gives them that status which we are

obliged to deny them? It may be suggested that even among ourselves it is possible for a person to be excluded from the Sacraments for disciplinary reasons in one diocese and to be admitted to them in another. We have to decide, therefore, whether a separated church can be regarded as constituting an ecclesiastical authority with jurisdiction in such matters.

The ancient patriarchates, dioceses, etc., of the East, now separated from Rome, once formed an integral part of the Catholic Body, to which they owe their existence. We cannot therefore altogether deny their right to exist, but only their right to be separate. They retain their identity as parts of the Church, not indeed formally (for the Catholic Body is undivided), but materially; and they are therefore capable of being corporately restored to unity. Now it must be clearly stated that within such bodies there can exist de jure no ecclesiastical authority whatsoever. Their internal organization and discipline, however, handed down from Catholic days, must be recognized as a beneficial de facto authority, and therefore as possessing a certain sanction. Strictly speaking, no doubt, every individual adherent of a separated body should forsake it at once and submit to the Church; but so long as this is morally impossible it is obviously better that the members of such a church should maintain their traditional unity and discipline, so as to enjoy

the privilege of the Sacraments.

The position of Anglicans is rather different. It is true that the external organization of the Church of England, into provinces, dioceses and so on, is largely an inheritance from the Catholic past, but in other respects the parallel with the Christian East can hardly be maintained. Where the Oriental bodies preserved substantial continuity in liturgy and belief, the Church of England made a clean break with the past, starting afresh with new service books and a new theology. This surely is of far greater moment than the mere survival of the old ecclesiastical framework and ministerial titles. Catholics generally hold, indeed, that such considerations are fatal to any pretence of real continuity in the Anglican body. and to any hope of corporate reunion; but the fact remains that the survival of the old Catholic organization, though a mere cadre or skeleton, might conceivably be taken into account in any future plans for the reconciliation of England with the Church. If the Anglican body as a whole, or such a considerable part of it as might be taken to represent the whole, showed any prospect of coming into line with the Catholic Body in faith, it might well be possible for Rome to regard the ancient provinces, dioceses and parishes as

having in a sense survived (though with invalid orders), and

therefore as capable of reinstatement.

As regards the question whether Anglicans, hoping for corporate reunion some day, are justified in staying where they are and giving a qualified allegiance to the Church of England, it should be pointed out that what was conceded above in the case of the Orthodox (who have valid Sacraments) does not apply to them. So long, however, as they honestly cannot see their way to individual submission one cannot blame them for availing themselves of whatever spiritual privileges are to be had in the Church of England.

JOSEPH HEALD.

### NEWS AND COMMENTS

Since it is hoped that this number will be out before the Church Unity Octave of 1943 (January 18th to 25th), we are publishing articles with this in view. The object of the Octave is prayer for Christian Unity, not Christian Cooperation, though this may prepare the ground for the former

—ut omnes unum sint. The purpose of Christian Co-operation "is to unite informed and convinced Christians all over the country in common action on broad lines of social and international policy." (For Joint Statement on Christian Co-operation see The Tablet, 30th May, 1942, and an excellent article in The Month, July-August, 1942, by Father M. Bévenot, S.J.). The Holy Father, however, in his jubilee broadcast specially stressed the present need of Christian Unity and the greater demand for prayer for this end. We have before us the report of last year's celebration of the Octave at Blackfriars, Oxford. This report is published by Blackwell, Oxford (Report of the Proceedings at the Church Unity Octave, held at Blackfriars, Oxford, 1942; 55.). These meetings were probably the most valuable contribution to the work of Christian Unity produced as yet in this country, and we hope will be the foundation on which much may be built. With the kind permission of the editor of the report we are reprinting Father Victor White's opening paper, "The Meaning of the Octave," and the reading of this article should urge our readers to get the full report.

The papers dealing with the Orthodox, "Photius, Father of Schism or Patron of Reunion," by Dr. Dvornik, "The Church of England and Catholic Unity," and Dr. Davis on "Christ in Nonconformist Spirituality," were of special interest, specially in the light of future work, though the other papers were of great value. The meetings were presided over by distinguished chairmen and in many cases discussion followed on the reading of the paper. The Dominican Fathers are indeed to be congratulated on this lead being given by Catholics in Oxford, a lead that should stimulate other gatherings in suitable centres up and down the country.

A new Tractate has been brought out by the S.P.C.U., "Christian Unity," being a sermon preached by Bishop (Anglican) Vibert Jackson. The bishop makes a strong appeal to Anglicans to prayer and work for reunion with the See of St. Peter; he sees the difficulties. At present, he says, "the most important road to reunion is common prayer,

common endeavour, common reliance and hope in the power of the Holy Spirit. Whatever we attempt, whether it be in the dogmatic or practical sphere, will fail for certain of its purpose if it be not the fruit of prayer."

The C.T.S. has published a most important tract, Catholics and Nonconformists by Father Vincent McNabb, O.P. Everyone interested in Christian Unity should get a copy and read it carefully. "Too long have Catholics and Free Churchmen been parted by an abyss," says Father Vincent. "How much high explosive have we fired at one another, Roman Catholic and Protestant, in the sad controversy of these past four hundred years—and in the main with little effect!" says Dr. N. Micklem in the introduction.

There is very little news to chronicle, hence what there is

we will insert here.

It is reported that the Pope has sent a mission headed by Cardinal Lavitrano to investigate the condition of the Church in German-occupied Russia (see *The Tablet*, 26th September, 1942). The Cardinal is Archbishop of Palermo and Apostolic Administrator of the Piana de Greci in Sicily for the Italo-Albanians with an Auxiliary Bishop of the Byzantine rite under him.

There is a very complete article by George Lubecki on German policy towards the Orthodox Church in Poland and the Ukraine in *The Tablet*, 19th September, 1942, so that one is pleased to get the report that the Metropolitan Anastasy, President of the Russian Synod of Bishops abroad, is not co-operating with the Germans (*ibid.*, 25th April, 1942).

The enclosed reached us from Shanghai dated June 27th,

1942, from Fathers Wilcock and Milner.

Unexpectedly an opportunity has arisen of sending you news, which Fr. Milner and I beg you to pass on to our parents and friends. Probably everyone is worried about us, but so far there has been no reason for it, since everything is going along quite normally, and both of us are in excellent health. Naturally prices of food have increased enormously, and our little reserves of money have been frozen in the bank. Still we are getting along very well in spite of all.

We inaugurated St. Michael's College on January 8th, in the presence of the Bishop and a large number of important persons. On the first day we had 37 pupils of whom more than half were already Catholics. The building has turned out a great success, though we had to find a lot of necessary equipment which left us with a big debt. Gradually during the past months our numbers have increased to 53, mostly of the higher class of Russians. We expect to have about 100 boys after the summer. We re-open on September 5th. Of our 53 boys, 16 are boarders, but only 6 have their meals with us; the other ten are with us all day and night, but just go home for their dinner and supper, and bring their breakfasts with them. Since the chief problem in war-time is that of food, this system is very good for us, and for the poorer parents is much cheaper.

Yesterday we had the first distribution of Reports. Most of the boys' parents came to the College and we celebrated a *Moleben* in the Chapel, and then distributed the reports in the big hall. The parents all seemed delighted and I think

they will do a lot of propaganda for our College.

On the Eve of Pentecost after Vespers, robbers got into our church and stole and destroyed a number of chalices, eikons, vestments, etc. Fortunately the Blessed Sacrament was not desecrated. We had to use the Convent chapel for two weeks. Then the Bishop came to us for the reopening of the church. After this disaster it was touching to see the expressions of sympathy from all over the Russian Colony. The clergy of one Orthodox church offered to lend any chalices, vestments, etc., that I needed. A number of the Orthodox also sent donations to repair the damage, and we have managed to repair almost all that was destroyed.

When the Most Rev. Ambrose Senyshyn, O.S.B.M., D.D., pastor of St. Nicholas' Ukrainian Greek Church in Chicago, is consecrated on October 22nd as Titular Bishop of Maina, he will become the youngest member of the hierarchy in the United States. The Bishop-elect is thirty-nine years of age, having been born in Galicia in 1903.

The consecration, which is scheduled to be held in St. Nicholas' Church, of which the Bishop-elect is pastor, will be the first one to be held in the Byzantine rite in the United States. It will also mark the first time a member of the Order of St. Basil has been elevated to the episcopacy in

this country.

Bishop-elect Senyshyn was educated in the Monastery colleges of Krechiw and Lawriw, in Galicia. He made his philosophical studies in Dobromil, Galicia, and his theological studies at Crystynopol, Galicia, and at Warsaw. He was ordained a priest of the Basilian Order on August 23rd, 1931, at Krechiw. Coming to the United States in 1933, he has since been active in parish work in Chicago.

Bishop Senyshyn will serve as Auxiliary Bishop of the Ukrainian Catholic Diocese, which has its seat in Philadelphia and numbers some 300,000 faithful in all parts of the country. The Most Rev. Constantine Bohachevsky, D.D., Titular Bishop of Amissus, is its Ordinary.—(The Lamp, Sept., 1942).

The following news items are reported in the Orthodox

Church Bulletin.

The Metropolitan Sergius received a telegram from the Patriarch Christoporos of Alexandria:—"The Apostolic Orthodox Church of Alexandria is proud of the continued brilliant victories of the Russians which make for a complete victory over the powerful forces of evil. We heartily congratulate the Orthodox Church of Russia and bless its deeds which will aid towards the triumph of the Allies and the assurance of peace among nations."

The condemnation of the so-called Metropolitan Polikarp by Metropolitan Sergius was approved by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch. (May, 1942).

The Serb Archpriest Zivoin Ristanovitch has come from America to London to look after the Serb Orthodox Colony there at the desire of the Yugoslav Government. Father Ristanovitch studied at St. Sava's Seminary, Belgrade, and completed his theological studies in Russia. In 1926 he was sent to the United States of America.

On Whit Sunday afternoon at a great act of United Christian Witness in Westminster Abbey, representatives of the Serbian, Russian and Greek Orthodox and of the Armenian Churches took part, headed by Archbishop Germanos. (June, 1942).

The Orthodox Bishops in America representing Greeks, Syrians, Serbs, Rumanians, Ukrainians and Carpatho-Russians, more than six million citizens, have announced their intention of upholding President Roosevelt. (July, 1942).

The death of the Anba John, the Coptic Patriarch, at the age of 87, is reported from the paper *Pantainos*, June 21st. The Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria was represented at the funeral. The Coptic Metropolitan George Josaphat has been appointed *locum tenens*. (August, 1942).

Bishop Gorazd of the Orthodox in Czechoslovakia was put to death by the Germans. (September and October, 1942).

The Patriarch of Constantinople replied to Dr. Temple, who had announced his translation to the see of Canterbury to the Œcumenical Patriarch. (October, 1942).

#### **OXFORD**

THE SOCIETY OF ST. JOHN DAMASCENE.

This Society was founded in the November of 1941 by Canon O. C. Quick, the Regius Professor of Divinity, Mr. Serge Bolshakoff of Christ Church, and Father Victor White, O.P., and its aim is the study of the faith and practice of the Christian East.

Three interesting meetings of the Society were held in Christ Church: the first on December 2nd, 1941, at which Dr. Quick was in the chair and Mr. Bolshakoff read a paper on the Conception of the Church as expounded by Alexis Khomyakov and Johann Moehler. On February 10th, 1942, Mr. E. Lampert dealt with the Sophianic Theology of Vladimir Soloviev and Fr. Sergius Bulgakov, and on the 12th May of the same year Dr. Dvornik read a paper on "The final rupture between East and West." The meetings were well attended and good discussions followed.

### THE FELLOWSHIP OF SS. ALBAN AND SERGIUS.

The Oxford group of the Fellowship gathers under the auspices of Mr. and Mrs. Lampert, meeting too in the rooms of the Warden of Keble (Rev. H. J. Carpenter) and also after the Liturgy at the Russian church. It has been very vigorous in its activities during 1941—1942. There was a series of public lectures on Russia in 1941, chiefly religious and cultural. Mr. Charles William read a paper about certain "Modern Sociological Heresies" and Mrs. N. Gorodetsky on "Modern Gnostic Heresies." Subjects on the Christian West, the Christian East and the Christian meaning of Western Democracy were discussed.

During the early part of August, 1942, a very full riverside camp was organized at Abingdon.

The following notes are from Mr. H. W. Codrington. "Shewed unto Thee, God and Father."

In the Greek liturgy of St. James we read in the Recital of Institution that our Lord, having taken bread into His hands, looked up to heaven and showed it to His Father. Most of the older Syriac texts of this liturgy as well as its

Georgian version omit the looking up to heaven, as does the Greek St. Basil. According to Liddell and Scott the primary meaning of the Greek verb in the title of this note is "lift up and shew," and the Georgian version referred to has "raised it aloft and shewed it to Thee."

Not a few of the West Syrian anaphoras have "shewed [it] to Thee," but the Syriac verb has no connotation of lifting up. In place of this expression in four texts, the last two not

independent documents, we find the following:-

'Severus.'—He took bread in His hands and stretched

[them] out to heaven, blessed, hallowed, brake. . . .

'Twelve Apostles I.'—He took bread upon His holy hands, and, stretching [them] out to heaven, blessed . . .

'Peter of Callinicus.'—He took bread upon His stainless

hands and lifted it up and gave thanks . . .

'St. Peter I.'—He took bread upon His stainless hands and

lifted it up . . . blessed, hallowed . . .

The combination of lifting up the bread and shewing it to God the Father in the Georgian 'St. James' has been noted above.

I know of no actual direction in the Syrian Rite that the bread is to be lifted up as described in the texts just quoted, but in view of the fact that the priest closely imitates our Lord's actions during the Recital of Institution it seems likely that such was done, anciently at least, if not at present. This ritual act certainly is found in the Coptic liturgy, an Arabic rubric at the words "Looked up to heaven to Thee," reading: He shall raise his hands with the bread while his gaze is directed upwards (Brightman, Litt. E. & W., p. 176). We find the same practice in the West in the middle ages. Thus, for example, the Alphabetum Sacerdotum (Tracts on the Mass, p. 44, Henry Bradshaw Soc.) directs as follows:—

Hic accipiat hostiam et teneat in manibus ante pectus suum

dicens: Qui pridie . . . manus suas.

Hic elevet manus dicendo: Et elevatis oculis . . . gratias

agens.

The lifting up of the bread seems to be connected with the raising of the eyes. Can any of the readers of this QUARTERLY throw any light on such connection from Latin ecclesiastical literature?

### A Syrian and an English Cardinal.

British Museum Harl. MS. 5512 was written in 1549 at the Abyssinian convent of St. Stephen in Rome by the Syrian Moses of Mardin for the Abyssinian bishop Sahyûn, resident in the same convent.

Inter alia it contains, of all unexpected things, considerable parts of the Roman missal, in the Latin tongue but in Syriac letters, though of what use this could have been to an Abyssinian prelate is not clear. But what interests us in this country is the mention at the end of the manuscript of three Cardinals, the last being "the Cardinal of England" (alkardinâl d'Inghilterra), none other than Reginald Pole.

### Summus Sacerdos Tuus Melchisedech.

The following passage from a prayer of incense (sedhrâ) in British Museum Add. 14520, ff. 140a–142a (VIII—IX century) is of some interest as providing an exact parallel to "summus sacerdos" applied to Melchisedech in the Roman Canon:—

Yea, we beseech Thee, O merciful God, as Thou didst receive from the hands of Melchisedech the great priest, who was of the Gentiles, the sacrifice which he offered unto Thy Godhead, so receive from our poor hands this Eucharist which we offer unto Thine honour.

The author of the prayer was the Monophysite patriarch of

Antioch, John I, who died in 648.

### THE PRAYERS FOR RUSSIA SAID AFTER LOW MASS.

### ORDER BY POPE PIUS XI.

"You doubtless remember, Venerable Brethren, how, after fixing St. Joseph's Day for a public offering of prayers to Almighty God in the Vatican Basilica, under Our own leadership, in view of the distressed state of religion in Russia, a large and devout concourse of people gathered to Our side: and how, from well-nigh every country of the world, many followed the admirable example of the people of Rome by visiting other Churches of the City, there to pour forth their prayers. For, as you know, our design met with universal approval, not only among Catholics, but even among large numbers of those who dissent from Us; for they offered supplications in their places of worship, as though moved by a sentiment of common brotherhood, and their gratitude to Us was expressed both publicly and privately. We thank the goodness and mercy of God, that so great a union of prayers has not proved vain and fruitless, although, not so very long since, in those regions we speak of, the enemies

of the Name of God and His worship have carried on more fiercely their persecution of the Church. We must, therefore, continue to implore from Christ, the Redeemer of the human race, the restoration of peace and of freedom of worship for the afflicted people of Russia; and, in order that all may be encouraged to this undertaking, without undue trouble or inconvenience, those prayers which Our Predecessor of happy memory, Leo XIII, ordered to be recited by priest and people after Mass, are henceforth to be said for this same intention, namely, for Russia. And let the Bishops and the secular and regular clergy most earnestly urge this duty upon their own people, and on those who are present at Mass, and often remind them of the same." (From the allecutio given at the Vatican June 30th, 1930. Acta Pii P.P. XI, p. 300).

As we go to press we regret to announce the death of Mr. H. W. Codrington. He was a most generous supporter and contributor to this quarterly. He died on November 7th. R.I.P.

### REVIEW OF REVIEWS

### CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

Theological Studies. The America Press, New York, 1940-1942.

This new quarterly was launched in 1940 under the editorship of the late Fr. William McGarry, S.J., and was sanctioned to be undertaken by the American Assistancy of the Society of Jesus. The publication is characterized by the wide choice of subjects, that keeping abreast of actualities, and the easy presentation of sometimes very complicated matters which all have come to appreciate in Jesuit publications. Perhaps the suggestion would not be taken amiss that, from the point of view of style and misprints, this particular publication is not yet on the level of its fellow-publications in other countries by members of the same Order. For readers of the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY there is much to glean. In 1940 alone there are no less than four articles connected with the Ecumenical Movement. The most important of these is by F. Edward L. Murphy and is entitled "Church Unity and the Protestant Missions." It rightly stresses the importance of the historical origin of the Movement in the conflict of the propagation of the faith. It is in the mission countries, far away from the homeland, that the missionaries began to realize the grave inconsequences of disseminating frankly contradictory pictures of Christianity. The Author estimates the number of Protestant Christians in mission countries at well over ten million. These are distributed between no less than 350 varying denominations and societies. It was the missionaries who first struck the blow at sectarianism. Mission Conferences were organized: New York 1854, London 1854, Liverpool 1860, Mildmay 1878, London 1881. New York 1900, Edinburgh 1910, and Jerusalem 1928. Gradually the barriers of nationality fell; then it was realized that the original distinction between the practical side (Life and Work) and the theoretical side (Faith and Order) was untenable with the result that, as in other manifestations of the Ecumenical Movement, the definition of the Church has been realized to be the only sound basis from which to hope a practical result. This could not happen without a gradual dawning on the minds of the promoters of the importance and position of Rome. Speaking of the most important of these Conferences, that of Edinburgh in 1910, Father Murphy rightly says: "The success of the Conference was almost entirely on the side of desire and sentiment and hope, but it was necessary to stir these desires and sentiments. Most important from our point of view was the admission that Rome and the Orthodox Churches must be embraced in Christian Unity; this indicates a definite progress in Protestant views upon unity." (Italics are mine). These words should be pondered upon by those who decry any contact with non-Catholics as fruitless and see nothing but insincerity in others. The problem of the return of all those millions of Christians to the one fold demands first of all a breakdown of mutual prejudice, and is emphatically a psychological problem. And a psychological problem cannot be settled by mere argument: it must grow into something normal. The Conferences resulted in the setting up of a World Council of Churches with headquarters at the Hague. The reading of Fr. Murphy's article also drives home the wisdom of Rome's conduct which may be summed up as a definite and final rejection of compromise. The promoters themselves came to the conclusion that compromise for the sake of peace could never result in comprehension for the sake of truth (the words are those of the Anglican Bishop of Southwark).

Apart from the always interesting chronicle of *Current Theology* we may be forgiven if, for the sake of saving space, we merely refer to important and interesting scriptural articles by Fathers P. Gächter and Laurence McGinley and John Collins; theological articles by Wilfrid Parsons, John Taylor and others; liturgical articles by Gerald Ellard and J. Quasten, and two important articles on *Social Action in the Early Church* 

by Paul Furfey.

T.W.

Russia and the West. The Changing World Series. No. 1. Price 6d. (23 Lower Belgrade Street, S.W.1.)

This issue is, first, extraordinarily good value for the money

both in the way of matter and of production.

Mrs. Harari in the introduction has some arresting paragraphs: "It is very important for us to understand Russia. We have tended to oversimplify her problems, to overlook the complex nature of her achievement, the many crosscurrents of Russian life and thought, of Eastern and Western influence that intersect in it. We cannot isolate her present phase from her history and tradition as though Marxism were a chemical formula that had been applied under laboratory conditions. . . . Yet in the undying reality of her aspiration towards human brotherhood lies Russia's message to the world. It is the expression not only of the old nor only of the new Russia; it is charged with the full significance of

her historical mission—that of a country who interprets the West to the East and the East to Europe, of a people who have been steeped for centuries in Christian life and who have faced their revolutionary crisis at a time when the world is

seething with revolutionary changes.

"It is most important for us to read this message rightly. The twentieth century meeting between the West and the East may prove to be destructive or creative and vivifying. It may turn out to be a combination of the godless materialism of the East and of the West, if so it will be because Western Christians will have failed to give meaning to our own aspirations and to our own outlook or to understand the religious

significance of our own social crisis."

Certainly the articles in this review do present Russia to us English people in a fairly whole and complete way. It is presented in a Christian way and in a way that the average present-day article or book on Russia ignores, and many of the articles are of great value in giving us a general foundation to build on and as a comment on much of the everyday reading on things Russian we may come across. One would, however, have liked—since this is an isolated treatment on Russia in a worldwide series—some suggestion as to how the ordinary reader should go on to a further study of this most important problem. The Christian (and other) reader needs guidance; an article given over to criticism of and other comment on the most important standard and popular books on Russia would have been of the greatest assistance in this line.

There is a further lacuna in the lack of any special treatment of what has been termed "Other Russia," the non-Christian Russia, "mute, uncommunicative, impervious to any culture or civilization known heretofore"—to quote Mme. Julia De Beansobre (see article in Sobornost, June, 1942). This was swept off its feet by Bolshevism and accepted its world outlook without reserve; this surely needs careful study! But having made these criticisms we most heartily recommend this review and we still hope that in the future the Editor may find it possible to return to this most important of subjects.

### NON-CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift, edited by Dr. Adolf Küry. Bern, 1940–1941.

This periodical which, as is known, was founded at the Congress of the Old-Catholics at Luzern in 1892, and continued in 1911 under its present name is the organ of "free-from-Rome Catholic churches" under the direction of the Old-Catholics. One wonders sometimes why still so many non-Catholics are so very anxious to maintain their separation from Rome whilst proclaiming their ecumenical intentions. Is it too much to suggest that at one of those Ecumenical Congresses this question be put and discussed with the same sincerity and humility which are so marked a feature in other discussions? The same thing holds good of theology, ethics, philosophy, etc., where one hardly ever finds a reference to Catholic works, although scientifically on the same, perhaps sometimes on a higher level. There is something here which is in contradiction with those proclamations of unity and impartiality and those desires of fulfilling Christ's will regarding

The first number contains an exposition of the teaching of the New Testament concerning the Church according to an Orthodox theologian, the Archimandrite Cassian. The approach is meant to be 'reinobjektiv' (purely objective) but one wonders how a theologian can be purely objective if he limits himself exclusively to his particular interpretation of the New Testament. The article thus looks like a Protestant, more particularly Lutheran, justification of the Orthodox position, and so makes the thesis somewhat arbitrary. Bertold Spuler writes on Orthodox declarations regarding the validity of Anglican Orders. Various approaches have been made. Those planned between Anglican delegations and the churches of Serbia and Bulgaria have been postponed by force of circumstances. The Author gives the views of various Orthodox theologians and treats in detail of the rejection of the validity by the Greek Orthodox Synod on 21st September, 1939. This decision was based on the opinions of various Professors of the theological faculty of Athens. Dr. Adolf Küry treats in the next article of the Congress of Orthodox Theology held at Athens in 1936. From the extensive quotations it would appear that there is a real danger of nipping the ecumenical movement in the bud. I mean this: the effect of the meetings of various denominations is twofold: it may break down un-Christian sectarianism; it may also revive a desire to re-inforce the sectarian spirit by wishing to

be quite different from the other denominations, a sort of Fascist mentality among the various national churches, particularly so in the East. The effort of some modern theologians seems to bear, not on an impartial revision of the whole theological position, but on those elements which mark off the Orthodox position from any other religious communion, instead of bringing out those points which are in common. This would seem to lead to an exaggeration of many things in Orthodox teaching which never had such an exclusive and outstanding value in the Orthodox past. Would anyone, even the Orthodox, gain by taking such a line? The next number of 1940 contains an Old-Catholic declaration on the report of the Edinburgh Conference of Faith and Order. Bertold Spuler continues his chronicle. The next and last number of 1940 brings two more articles on the Ecumenical Movement and a description of the results brought about by the extension of the "Association of Councils" (if I may thus translate the German Rätebund) in Eastern Europe, and a continuation of the chronicle. From the two numbers of 1941 we choose, as particularly interesting, G. E. Hollenbach's article on the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the founding of the Russian Church and K. Neuhaus' article on Roman-Catholic voices in the Ecumenical Movement with special reference to the Papacy. There is still a narrow exegesis traceable in H. Katzenmayer's essay on the Primacy in the first letter of Clement I. We may refer to some principles laid down, from the point of view of mere sound historical investigation, in History and Hierarchy by the late William McGarry, S.J., in Theological Studies, 1940, p. 284 ff.

T.W.

### OTHER REVIEWS RECEIVED.

Magnificat: (Oxford).

Liturgical Arts: (New York).
Orate Fratres: (Collegeville, Min.).

The Star of the East: (Travancore, South India).

The Coracle: (Iona).

### RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Catholic Art and Culture. By E. I. Watkin. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne). pp. 176. 9s.

Mr. Watkin is one more layman who gives the Catholic world excellent matter to think about, and this latest of his books is one that every intelligent Catholic should read. Like Christopher Dawson, to whom he acknowledges his indebtedness, Mr. Watkin is chiefly concerned with the problems of the Catholic religion-culture, aspects of which he discusses from its origin to modern times.

The book is not a history of the Faith, but an attempt at some valuation of the art and culture which are by-products of the Faith. We think it of some importance that the reader should remember this: otherwise, one might be in danger of estimating the achievement of the Catholic religion according to the measure of its influence on the culture of

the day.

We think Mr. Watkin at his best in the period that deals with what he describes as the Classical Autumn and the Christian Spring; almost as good in his account of Medieval Christendom—the Christian Summer; then—at least, as we read it, there begins his decline—though Mr. Watkin obviously is serenely joyful through the Autumn of the Baroque, when he indulges his personal taste and sentiment. But his preference for Baroque is surely difficult to justify by the criterion of criticism set by his own "Philosophy of Form." Baroque art and culture, admittedly beautiful at its best, is somewhat accidental and superficial as compared with that of the Middle Ages; the result of a compromise, when the counter-Reformation tried to make the best of things. The gardens of Versailles are beautiful; but you can see Versailles only against the background of the Revolution.

What Mr. Watkin has to say about the consequences of the abandonment of contemplative prayer is truly excellent, and no man has done more than he to encourage a return to that saner and more fruitful way of Christian life. It is his and our only hope in this Winter of the Modern World. But the return to the contemplative ideal will not, we think, be achieved without the return of the inheritance of classical culture which Mr. Watkin says no longer exists. We doubt if Christianity will ever be separated from the classical tradition. We even doubt, as a matter of history, if either will survive

without the other. And the great hope of our time is that the love of the hidden realities of the contemplative life is accompanied by a revival of living interest in the great authors of classical antiquity. We are witnessing a possible return of the Christian Spring—the promise and fashion of which Mr. Watkin tells so well.

F.A.W.

The Reformation in England—II: Introduction of the Reformation into England: Edward VI (1547—1553). By G. Constant. (Sheed & Ward, 1941). pp. 349. 16s.

This second volume of the Abbé Constant's history of the English Reformation maintains the standard of its predecessor. There are two considerations which lend a peculiar value to this work of the Abbé Constant. In the first place he is a foreigner, and as such he is able to write on this subject with a detachment and an objectivity to which no Englishman can hope to attain—least of all the modern unbeliever who thinks himself above sectarian controversy. In the second place M. Constant is a Catholic priest and is thus equipped with the technical doctrinal and liturgical training which are necessary for the full understanding by the historian of what

happened at the Reformation.

A good illustration of this second point is furnished by the contrast between the book under review and Professor Powicke's recent reprint (1941) of his masterly study of the Reformation in England. Professor Powicke informs us in his opening sentence that "the one definite thing which can be said about the Reformation in England is that it was an act of State," and he proceeds to analyse the constitutional and legal implications of the English Reformation perhaps better than it has ever been done before. But, however true it be that the English Reformation was a constitutional readjustment carried through under the forms of law, we must not forget that it brought in its train a profound change in the inner spiritual life of the English people. The Church is the external expression and guardian of the interior life of its members, and a revolutionary change in the external character of the Church must either produce or imply an equally revolutionary change in the souls of men.

It is perhaps the greatest merit of the Abbé Constant's book that, on the sound principle of *lex orandi lex credendi*, he makes a detailed study of the liturgical changes made under Edward VI. The result of this study, unemphasized but crystal clear, is the conviction left in the reader's mind that the Reformation

radically modified the spiritual life of English Christians. It was then that Englishmen acquired a spiritual outlook and a code of religious belief and practice which differentiated them—and in time isolated them mentally—from their fellow Europeans. There has been no comparable parting of the ways in the history of our race, and the Abbé Constant deserves well of English historical scholarship for having so presented the results of his researches as to make this more than ever manifest.

A.T.

A Detection of Aumbries. By Dom Gregory Dix, Monk of Nashdom Abbey. (The Dacre Press). pp. 5—72. 3s. 6d. net. The first thing that strikes one about this admirable brochure is the inimitable title. The Study is really a work of Detection in the History of Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. Dom Gregory points out that it is an Appendix to a projected work on the Liturgy, but the reader must not be led astray by this. This is a work of real scholarship presented in an eminently interesting way. It covers the ground from the earliest period to the present day both in the matter of the fact of reservation and its purpose and place. The mass of evidence brought forward is almost formidable but the impression left is that the author is working with an eye to an "ulterior" motive. The particular axe being ground under the circumstances no other than the matter of Reserva-

tion and Anglicanism.

It is impossible in a short review to take the book piece by piece, and indeed it is doubtful whether in doing so it would be possible to point out the "ulterior" motive in any particular place. This impression is really only gained as one reads on. It is not that Dom Gregory merely adduces the evidence that will prove his thesis or rather his motive and neglects the rest. Rather it is that his interpretation is negative. To take an example; Dom Gregory points out the number of Episcopal enactments concerning the Place of Reservation, that is whether in a Hanging Pyx or in an Aumbry, and from this goes on to deduce that the clergy, practically as a body, completely ignored these enactments. Many of these Decrees were laid down with extreme penalties. It is not possible that the majority of the clergy could have ignored them and, in the modern phrase, have got away with it. Surely Dom Gregory is reading more into this than the evidence can support. It sounds suspiciously like an unconscious attack of "Private Judgment." The author seems to be shouldering the clergy from the twelfth century onwards with that attitude to Bishops which is such an outstanding feature of the clergy of the Church of England. Even in the centuries of less centralized authority, that of the Bishops in matters of Doctrine and Discipline was by no means ignored. The evidence is necessarily on the side of breach of discipline since only such cases would come up for review at a Synod or Visitation.

However, this matter does not cancel out the usefulness of this work. The amount of research entailed seems out of proportion to the actual book and it is to be hoped that we shall hear more from Dom Gregory before long.

S.A.T.

The Christian Church and the Soviet State. By Serge Bolshakoff.

(S.P.C.K. 1942). 3s. 6d.

There is a glut of literature (books and articles) whose object is to explain Russia and the Russian people to the English public. At last the English people (apart from that section which has been bitten by Communism and a smaller section with an interest in Eastern Christianity) want to know all they can about their Russian allies. The present war and thoughts concerning its aftermath have brought this about.

There is indeed much to learn because the founding of the Soviet State is by no means the straightforward and simple working out of cause and effect that some writers want to make out. Russia has always been a mystery to the West and in spite of these recent explanations it still remains one; for it is the mystery of a nation discovering and fighting to save its soul and there can be no real attempt to solve

this at the present time.

The book before us is, however, a very clear and hopeful statement of events from the Christian point of view, and it is very important for the British public to realize that one cannot attempt to understand the Russians except from their Christian past. Perhaps the best account we know of the revolution and the background of the present U.S.S.R. is to be found in the two books of Nicolas Berdyaev—The Russian Revolution (1931), and The Origin of Russian Communism (1937), but Serge Bolshakoff presents us with a handbook of 75 pages well written and, we think, impartial, condensing Russia's past history and dealing with the present time. It is a book that can be read quickly and will act as a very necessary antidote to the literature, either written from a Communist or from an entirely secularist point of view, that only presents one side (and not always a true side) of the picture.

We think Mr. Bolshakoff should have stressed that the Mohammedans, the Asiatic idolatrous population of the Russian hinterland, also form a background to the present picture of Russia.

B.W.

Ancient England. By Edmund Vale. (Batsford). 10s. 6d. English Church Craftsmanship. By F. H. Crossley. (Batsford). 8s. 6d.

These are two more of Messrs. Batsford's well known "British Heritage" series. The scope of Mr. Vale's work, as indicated by its sub-title, is limited to monuments and remains in public care and ownership. It covers to some degree all periods from the pre-historic, an introductory chapter being followed by others on the primitive, the Roman and the "pre-Norman" periods, after which castles, monuments of religion and houses are treated separately, the last by Mr. Harry Batsford. It is an interesting, and within its limits, thorough, survey. It is not quite restricted to buildings in public care and this perhaps is a pity as the selection of buildings and monuments discussed is inevitably limited and may seem rather arbitrary. In more than one place there are references to Celtic Christianity which are likely to give an erroneous impression of its relations to the Catholic Church. Mr. Crossley's work provides a valuable supplement to the more general studies in the series, giving a fairly detailed history, copiously illustrated, of the development of the various church crafts.

The most valuable service this series can render in showing something of the material heritage for which, among other things, we fight, is to remind us that it, and the spiritual heritage of which it is the outward sign, is to some extent a lost, or rather, a wantonly destroyed heritage, not merely to be defended but to be recovered. Mr. Crossley gives a useful hint for the interpretation of our history in coupling the material destruction of the Reformation with the recent ravages of Hitler: they are the outward signs of a progressive

spiritual havoc.

W.T.R.

Children in Soviet Russia. By Deana Levin. (Faber & Faber, Ltd.). pp. 5—196. 6s. net.

To the Catholic faced with the perennial problem of "Our Catholic Schools," this book should come as a warning. Comrade Levin is at least an enthusiast for the Soviet Ideal of Education, as far as such a high ideal may be put into practice. We are told that the methods used are variable—in a state of flux—that much remains for the perfecting of the machinery. One impression at least is gained, that of almost terrible efficiency—of a tense straining to bring about the resolution of ideal in the shortest possible time. Here there is no compromise—all must bow down to the end in view—parent, child and teacher. Efficient Soviet education is the watchword.

Much of the method outlined is the result of the modern psychological outlook, although it may be pointed out that such methods are and have been used by many teachers in schools in other times and countries, even in the Democracies. The individual approach and attention: competitive methods: inter-class or inter-school contests for Red banners or even Union Jacks are not so devastatingly modern. What however is significant is the expression of the ideology that education is a matter for the State—that the parent is as it were an unavoidable evil, allowed to co-operate as far as the State thinks fit, but without the slightest authority in

matters touching the fundamentals of education.

Religion being naturally ruled out in a professedly Atheistic State, the authority of the State becomes supreme, and presumably the authority of the State in education is that power which we call the Board of Education—a power ultimately in the hands of its Director, whatever may be said concerning such roseate hued ideals of Commissions of enquiry and technical advisers. For the Materialist, here is perhaps an Utopian picture of Education. For those of us who acknowledge a higher divinity than Matter, the system as portrayed is repulsive in the extreme. It is difficult to find fault with much that is said provided that one thinks of Education in terms of imparting and imbibing a given amount of material, or in the fostering of a particular ideology. It is "education" pushed to extreme limits. It is knowledge without Learning: it is the assimilation of various assorted facts, admirably coordinated at times, but without the slightest effect of culture an edifice built precariously on sand. It would be a mistake to belittle the effects produced by such a system—one feels the fierce ardent nature of the fanatic in the people concerned. It is definitely "Education for all": an attempt, ruthless in the extreme, to bring about the worship of the State as the ultimate goal and it bids fair to achieve its end. Comrade Levin is evidently one of the missioners of this new Gospel, awaiting the dawn of Education and the State after the long night of Culture and the Parent.

S.A.T.

The Cluniacs. By Dom Romanus Rios, O.S.B. Reprinted from Pax, n.d., pp. 46. (Catholic Records Press, Exeter).

This series of articles contains a valuable résumé of recent studies of Cluny, especially of M. Guy de Valous' monumental Le Monachisme Clunisien. It makes light reading and gives the impression of exact information; the whole is enlivened by the Author's obvious enthusiasm for the Benedictine tradition, and is not burdened with what would probably still be premature final judgements. It remains exceedingly difficult rightly to appreciate the influence of Cluny. So many subtle factors converge in Cluny's achievement that the distinction, for instance, between what must be attributed to the spirit of the time, the influence of individual personalities and the spirit of the Cluniacs as a body, is most difficult to draw. The section on Spain, whose influence on Europe as a whole is so strangely ignored, is particularly welcome. If one is allowed to make any suggestions at all, it might have been very illuminating to go more deeply into the sources and development of Cluniac spirituality. It would also have been interesting to see if and how the East, which in the ninth century exercised such a strong influence on Europe through Italy and later through the crusades, is in any way responsible for the heavy weight of ceremonies and choirobligations. There is an important article on the spirit of this un-liturgical excess of liturgy in the Festschrift: Heilige Uherlieferung by Dom Stephan Hilpisch.

T.W.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Warburg Institute: A hand list of Illuminated Oriental Christian Manuscripts. Hugo Buchthal and Otto Kurz. The Epworth- Press: The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion. A. W. Harrison.

S.P.C.K.: Serbian Church Life. R. M. French. Burns Oates: The History of the Primitive Church. Vol. I. Jules Lerbreton, S.J., and Jacques Zeiller (trans.). S.C.M. Press: How Christians Worship. Edited by J. Eric Fenn.